

MEETING HIGHLIGHTS
Hanford Site Technology Coordination Group
Management Council

EESB Snoqualmie Room
Wednesday, May 21, 1997
8:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.

Purpose:

- To establish the framework and communication processes for the STCG as recommended by the Ad Hoc Committees
- To discuss and resolve issues related to the Deployment Center

Outcomes:

- Understanding and endorsement of revised STCG mission, scope, and Management Council roles and responsibilities
- Definition of next step for Subgroup roles and responsibilities
- Agreement on communication action items and assignment of responsibilities
- Understanding of and feedback on Deployment Center roles

Agenda Items:

- Introduction/Safety/Continuous Process Improvement
- Updates
 - Technology Deployment Initiative
 - Mixed Waste Focus Area - Issues with Needs Response
 - Technology Update - Laser Cutting
 - Large-Scale Demo Results
- Ad Hoc Committee -- VOTE
 - A vote was taken to approve the revised mission statement, along with the comments agreed to during discussion: 12 yes, 1 no
- Communications Plan -- VOTE
 - A vote was taken to approve the recommendations of the Communications Subcommittee: yes, unanimous

- Deployment Center Status -- Questions and Answers
 - The Mission Statement and goals of the Hanford Technology Deployment Center were presented. A brief status was given, and a discussion period followed.
- Wrap-Up
 - The next meeting is scheduled for June 18, 8:30-12:30 in the EESB Snoqualmie Room.

Actions:

- Letter to MWFA in response to their latest response (wait until revised response is received)
 - Joe Waring
- Letter to D&D Focus Area on their response to our Large-Scale Demo proposal -- Rick Gonzales
- Send copies of the Alm/Frank Congressional Committee testimony to Bob Cook, Dirk Dunning, and Tom Engel -- Debbie Trader
- Ad Hoc Committee to examine Subgroup roles and responsibilities with the Subgroup leads -
 - Lloyd Piper
- All issues for next meeting need to have information sent out ahead of time -- Shannon Saget
- All members should mark up the condensed Communications Plan for the next meeting -- ALL
- Status of deployment actions with vendors and with projects -- Deployment Center

HANFORD SITE TECHNOLOGY COORDINATION GROUP MANAGEMENT COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES

EESB Snoqualmie Room
Wednesday, May 21, 1997
8:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.

INTRODUCTION/SAFETY/CONTINUOUS PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT

An introduction was provided by Maureen Hunemuller.

- John Wagoner is on detail to Brookhaven for approximately two months. Lloyd Piper is acting manager for DOE-RL during this period. He will continue to work with the STCG.
- All those who had worked on the Technology Deployment Initiative (TDI) proposals were thanked.
- Al Alm and Clyde Frank testified to a congressional oversight committee on the deployment of technologies. The next step might be to call the Field Office managers or the other DASs to testify. Debbie Trader has a copy of the testimony if anyone wants to see it.
- Tom Engel is now an official member of the Management Council from the Hanford Advisory Board. Gordon Rogers is the alternate.

Dirk Dunning provided a safety reminder to avoid combining organic chemicals with oxygen. The result is highly unstable and tends to explode. The discussion then went to the recent explosion at PFP. Ron Gerton or Jim Mecca are contacts for information on this event. It was suggested that Michele Gerber should put together information on the PFP history and provide it to the public reading room.

Purpose:

- To establish the framework and communication processes for the STCG as recommended by the Ad Hoc Committees
- To discuss and resolve issues related to the Deployment Center

Outcomes:

- Understanding and endorsement of revised STCG mission, scope, and Management Council roles and responsibilities
- Definition of next step for Subgroup roles and responsibilities
- Agreement on communication action items and assignment of responsibilities

- Understanding of and feedback on Deployment Center roles

UPDATES

- Shannon Saget reminded the members of the purpose of the norm cards and asked that they remember to use them when necessary.
- Tom Engel provided information on a workshop to be held at the University of Washington, May 29-30, 1997. The subject is Scientific & Engineering Challenges in Remediation of Contaminated Soil and Groundwater.
- Debbie Trader introduced Tom McClain, Director of Communications at PNNL. He will recommend an external affairs representative, who will attend the STCG Management Council meetings to provide external communications for the group.

Technology Deployment Initiative

Dave Biancosino gave an update on the TDI proposals. There were 14 proposals submitted, and all of them passed through the first screen. The selection date is June 9. If anyone wants a copy of the proposals, please let Dave know. The proposals represented \$12M in TDI funding requested, and \$644M in cost savings over 35 years. Following is the chronology of the TDI proposal process:

2/19	STCG Management Council was briefed
3/7	The RFP was received
3/19-26	Proposal concepts were developed
3/26	STCG Subgroups were briefed
4/16	Received STCG Management Council endorsement
5/12	Proposals were submitted
6/9	Selection decision

The Department of Ecology has endorsed all proposals and has asked to review the deployment plans as they are written.

Mixed Waste Focus Area Response

Joe Waring reported that the MWFA response to our technology needs was poor. It was not in the right format and did not meet Hanford needs, specifically for characterization and treatment of remote-handled mixed waste. The MWFA has apologized for the poor response and is preparing a more detailed response. They indicated that they will be getting involved with remote handling in FY 1998. Roger Collis suggested that a letter from the STCG might help. It was decided to wait until we get the revised response from them. It will be discussed in the Subgroup meeting and recommendations made. Bob Cook suggested that the STCG send a letter to DOE asking that the MWFA be replaced. It was decided to wait until we get the response that is currently being prepared.

Technology Update -- Laser Cutting Demonstration

Keith Pauley from PNNL provided an update on the laser cutting technology being demonstrated in the 324 building. Bob Cook asked if anything was being done to prevent fires while cutting. Keith said that a fire extinguisher is nearby and that there is a person on fire watch during cutting. A video was shown of a remote manipulator cutting a 4-inch titanium pipe. Babcock & Wilcox wants them to plan and implement cutting of a bridge crane in B-cell. This demonstration laser will be the one that will be immediately deployed. It is 50-200% faster than the arc plasma torch and creates 80% less airborne effluents, so HEPA filters are changed out less frequently. The demonstration uses commercially available laser equipment in a remote-handled environment and in a high-radiation field. Funding for the demonstration is \$550K from EM-50 and approximately \$200K from EM-60. It was noted that this technology is the first proposal that went through the STCG.

Large-Scale Demonstration

Rick Gonzales reported that our 324 Building technology demonstration proposal was not funded. The winners were Rocky Flats and Oak Ridge. The U-Plant characterization proposal is still being considered. One of the comments from the selection process was that Hanford had no flexibility in the schedule to accommodate demonstrations.

AD-HOC COMMITTEE -- VOTE

Lloyd Piper summarized the STCG mission as modified by the Ad-Hoc Committee: "... to drive effective use of alternative technologies, technology development, and applied science to achieve improved performance and safer, faster, and more cost-efficient results for Hanford." The Committee added more detail to the mission and the Management Council roles and responsibilities.

The Management Council must be more focused on technology issues. The Site works to an existing technology baseline while, at the same time, includes alternatives to the baseline in the planning process. Blue-sky thinking and non-DOE inputs (e.g., from the STCG) result in these planning alternatives.

Following are comments on the revised mission, scope, and roles and responsibilities of the STCG Management Council.

- Under the Roles and Responsibilities section, "secondary" beneficiaries should be changed to "primary" beneficiaries. That change will be made.
- Bob Cook suggested that, in the second bullet under the Mission, the word "seek" be changed to "achieve." It was decided not to make this change.
- Suggestions were made by Dirk Dunning to reword the second bullet under the Mission as follows:

Identify, prioritize using systems analysis, and seek consensus on Hanford Site and program specific problems, science and technology needs, and requirements. Recognize baseline schedule insertion points for technology. Focus on the baseline, but also identify technologies to support potential baseline alternatives if they offer risk reduction benefits or high financial return on investment by improvements in environmental, safety, or health protection. Devote 20% of the STCG effort to science needs and 80% to technology needs and deployment.

These changes will be incorporated.

The Ad Hoc Committee was asked to review progress over the past year and compare it to the revised mission. The committee will also address Subgroup roles and responsibilities with the Subgroup leads.

The vote was taken to approve the revised mission statement, along with the comments noted above: 12 yes, 1 no

COMMUNICATIONS PLAN -- VOTE

Gary Ballew talked through the six recommendations by the STCG Communications Subcommittee. A draft of the condensed Communications Plan was provided to the members, and an action was given for them to put their comments on the plan and bring it back to the next meeting. Members were also asked to add their e-mail address to the comment cards so they can be added to the address list.

The vote was taken to approve the recommendations of the Communications Subcommittee: yes, unanimous

NEXT MEETING AGENDA ITEMS

- Follow up on vendor panel (status of barriers they identified)
- C-Reactor update and lessons learned
- TDI proposal results (STCG role in deployment plans and lessons learned)
- EMSP Results
- Focus Area funding decisions on technology needs
- Technology and science needs process/calendar
- Statistics on number of vendor contacts and status of each

The next meeting is scheduled for June 18, 8:30-12:30 in the EESB Snoqualmie Room.

DEPLOYMENT CENTER STATUS -- QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

Terry Walton presented the mission statement and goals of the Hanford Technology Deployment Center (HTDC).

Mission: The Hanford Technology Deployment Center (HTDC) will, through active partnerships, enhance the effectiveness of environmental cleanup by: 1) facilitating deployment of alternative technologies and processes identified in response to project needs, and 2) fostering the movement of technologies from demonstration to deployment to commercialization in support of community and regional economic stability.

The Deployment Center will focus on what needs to be done that's not currently being covered by other groups such as the Hanford Advisory Board, the STCG Management Council and Subgroups, PHMC, BHI, and PNNL. The three major activities are:

- Expanded communication, including outreach to industry and communicating successes and lessons learned,
- Barrier removal, and
- Integration across the Site to expand and grow the market.

A brief status was given:

- TDI -- This was a useful process in understanding relationships and the decision process for deployment of technologies.
- The HTDC team has been formed and is ready to respond
- Two HTDC start-up meetings have been held (April and May)
- EM-50 technical integration meetings are moving to the HTDC forum.

A list of demonstrations and deployments completed or planned at Hanford was handed out.

Following are questions and comments from the group:

Maureen Hunemuller asked if they will be providing a lessons learned discussion on TDI. This can be discussed in the next meeting.

Dirk Dunning commented that barrier removal is important. Dennis Faulk reminded the group that barriers were identified earlier and a procurement protocol was drafted. He asked what has happened to it. He expressed disappointment that everything done earlier seems to be gone. Terry responded by saying that two protocols were written, procurement and demonstration planning. He reiterated that the HTDC is focusing on what is needed to be done that is not already being worked elsewhere.

It was noted that there are 41 planned demonstrations this year; the list contains everything that's happening in the Programs at Hanford. Tom Engel stated that HTDC should be outside the DOE complex and not take credit for what's already being done by the Programs. HTDC should be the vehicle to break down barriers for outside vendors.

Rick Gonzales asked that the HTDC keep a current list of contacts so they can respond to outside requests.

Kim Koegler stated that the HTDC facilitates communication and breaks down barriers. They do not do demonstrations or deployments. They need to figure out what the real barriers are. When they asked the Programs which demonstrations and deployments they support, several dropped off the list.

Bob Julian commented that the HTDC cannot take credit for the demonstrations and deployments on the list and asked if the HTDC has done anything that helps deployments on Site.

Several members stated that vendors complain that they can't get access to the Site. They want to know how to get in. Tom Anderson said to tell them to call the HTDC and they will follow through. He also said that the HTDC probably won't be able to take credit for any demonstrations or deployments for at least a year. He asked the group to be patient, they think they are headed in the right direction.

Tom Engel said that HTDC looks like a PR organization, publicizing the results. They need to demonstrate that they can get new vendors on Site; they should benefit industry as a whole, not just the contractors on Site. Terry Walton responded that they are working on outreach to industry and expanding the market, but they aren't there yet.

Rick Gonzales commented with regard to communicating with vendors that, if the answer is "no," then tell them "no."

Debbie Trader closed the discussion by stating that the HTDC was created for two reasons: to define user and project needs and to get deployments communicated. An action was given to provide a status of vendor contacts. How many vendors were contacted, how many have gone to deployment, how many are currently being worked, and how many were told no.

ACTION ITEMS

- Letter to MWFA in response to their latest response (wait until revised response is received)
-- Joe Waring
- Letter to D&D Focus Area on their response to our Large-Scale Demo proposal -- Rick Gonzales
- Send copies of the Alm/Frank Congressional Committee testimony to Bob Cook, Dirk Dunning, and Tom Engel -- Debbie Trader
- Ad Hoc Committee to examine Subgroup roles and responsibilities with the Subgroup leads -
- Lloyd Piper
- All issues for next meeting need to have information sent out ahead of time -- Shannon Saget
- All members should mark up the condensed Communications Plan for the next meeting --
ALL
- Status of deployment actions with vendors and with projects -- Deployment Center